Cumulative Table of Cases Connecticut Appellate Reports Volume 179

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Colon v. Commissioner of Correction	30
Dean v. Kahn	58
Doyle v. Universal Underwriters Ins. Co	9
Stack v. Hartford Distributors, Inc. Arbitration; whether trial court properly rendered judgment granting application for order to proceed to arbitration regarding termination of plaintiff's employment; claim that termination of plaintiff's employment did not involve dispute arising out of interpretation or enforcement of parties' employment agreement and, therefore, that arbitration provision contained in that agreement was not applicable; claim that employment contract was void and unenforceable; whether issue of validity of employment contract should be considered by arbitrator in first instance where party did not challenge arbitration clause in employment agreement.	22
Stanley v. State's Attorney (Memorandum Decision)	901 81
witness' statement was harmless. State v. Jackson	40

that state violated separation of powers doctrine when it added witness tampering charges to substitute information without judicial determination as to whether probable cause existed for added offenses; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's sixth amendment right to confrontation and abused its discretion when it prevented him from asking witness certain questions on recross-examination.	
State v. Mukhtaar	1
Murder; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motions to correct	
illegal sentence and to allow expert witness to testify; claim that defendant's	
chronological age at time of crime was not representative of mental age; claim	
that trial court should have applied rationale of Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460)	
and its progeny to adult defendant whose mental age, at time of crime, was not	
substantially different from that of juvenile; whether trial court was required under	
Miller necessarily and expressly to take defendant's mental state into consideration	
at sentencing where defendant was twenty years old at time of crime; whether	
defendant set forth colorable claim for relief under <i>Miller</i> : whether trial court	
lacked subject matter jurisdiction over motion to correct illegal sentence; whether	
trial court properly denied motion to allow expert testimony.	
	001
State v Stanley (Memorandum Decision)	901